

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/894,919	06/29/2001	Robert Bruce Hirsh	06975-200001/ Security 13 4606		
26171 75	90 08/17/2005		EXAMINER		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022			CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA		
	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2136		
			DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005	DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/894,919	HIRSH, ROBERT BRUCE
Examiner	Art Unit
David G. Cervetti	2136

	David G. Cervetti	2136	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 8/2/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	NCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belo appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); iter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co		PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20,21,24-28,30-39 and 55-95. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.			nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
13. ☑ Other: <u>PTO-892</u> .		Exemple	.
	(# .s	nong Examina 202131 21265	-

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Cohen et al. teach an intermediary which receives and authenticates request from users, and then receives the requests to access an application. Limiting the use of an authorization information to a predetermined threshold number was/is well known (i.e. ATM machines allow users to enter PIN numbers up to a threshold number). The use of one time passwords was/is also conventional and well known (chapter 10 of the Handbook of Applied Cryptography by Menezes et al., pages 385-424, and Cohen et al. column 15, lines 25-35), client-server communications were also conventional and well known, thus the name client-server architecture, because client stations accessed a server via a network, without the use of an intermediary. Direct authentication was also conventional and well known as admitted by Applicant in the Backgroud section of the specification (page 1, lines 6-16). Regarding claim 67, Cohen expressly teaches wherein the client receives the credentials from the intermediary and then the client uses that information to logon to resources. Regarding claim 81, the use of trusted connections between servers and clients was conventional and well known as taught by Hardy et al. (US Patent Number 6,073,242) and Thompson et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,253).